

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the first office action. A three (3) month extension of time is also submitted.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of “potentially allowable” subject matter. To this end, the Examiner will note that claim 1 has been rewritten to set forth what the undersigned believes the Examiner had in mind. In particular, the Examiner will note that the prototypical model is now defined as including data indicative of “changing content.” For the reasons set forth in the Office action at page 2, claim 1 as amended is now deemed to patentably distinguish over the alleged “admitted prior art.” Of course, the undersigned is prepared to work with the Examiner if additional wording changes are considered advisable.

Claims 2-29 have been amended to make the wording more understandable, to address phrases that lacked antecedent basis, to add punctuation, and to conform the wording to the changes to parent claims where appropriate. No new matter has been included. These claims are deemed to describe patentable subject matter as they depend from claim 1.

To simplify the remaining issues, independent claims 29 and 41 have been rewritten and each is now dependent from claim 1. Independent claims 36 and 38 have been cancelled, as have dependent claims 30-37 and 39-40. Thus, from the original claim set only claim 1 remains independent.

The §101 rejection of claims 1-48 is noted, but this rejection is now believed to be moot. Claim 1 is a method claim and describes statutory subject matter directed to a method of performing an application layer semantic analysis to detect information access anomalies. As all former claims now depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, claims 1-29 and 41-48 no longer merely recite just “nonfunctional descriptive material.” They are clearly statutory.

The §102 rejection of claims 25-48 is noted, but this rejection is also moot in view of the amendments. The admitted prior art does not include the subject matter of amended

claim 1, as required by 35 USC 102(b) and MPEP 2131 (which requires that the “identical invention” be found in the prior art).

New claim 49 is independent and is provided to afford the applicant with the full scope of protection for this invention. The Examiner will note that new claim 49 includes the “changing content over time” limitation that has been indicated to be potentially allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 40 should also be in condition for allowance, for the reasons previously advanced. Claims 50-51 depend from independent claim 49. This subject matter is neither disclosed nor suggested by prior art known to the applicant.

For these reasons, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/David H. Judson/

By:

David H. Judson, Reg. No. 30,467

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT